Atty

George Beckett (CONS/PE)
Armas, J. Todd (for Petitioner/Conservator Doris Beckett

Fifth Amended Account and Report of Conservator and Petition for its Settlement

Age: 81	L vears		DORIS BECKET	<u>.</u> ГТ.	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
DOB: 1/12/1931		spouse/Conservato	,		
		Account period: 11/13/07 – 9/30/11		Examiner is unable to review these pleadings. The pleadings have incomplete sentences and paragraphs and do not make sense.	
Cont. fr	rom		Accounting Beginning POH	\$129,262.22 \$ 22,004.96	Accounting is not verified or signed by the
Aff	f.Sub.Wit.		Ending POH	\$ 5,770.60	Conservator. Probate Code §1020. Note: the
Vei	rified	Χ		, , , , , , , , ,	accounting is signed by the attorney. It has not been verified. An attorney cannot verify for a
Inv	ventory		Current bond \$24	4,500.00	fiduciary therefore the accounting must be
PTO	C		~		verified by the Conservator.
No	ot.Cred.		Conservator -	not addressed	Notice of the Heaving has not been given
No	otice of		Attorney -	not addressed	Notice of the Hearing has not been given.
Hrg	g		Attorney -	not addressed	
Aff	f.Mail				
Aff	f.Pub.				
Sp.	.Ntc.				
Pei	rs.Serv.				
Coi	nf. Screen				
Let	tters				
Du	ities/Supp				
Ob	jections				
Vid	deo				
Red	ceipt				
CII	Report				
920	02				
Ord	der				
Aff	f. Posting				Reviewed by: KT
Sta	atus Rpt				Reviewed on: 3/2/12
UC	CCJEA				Updates:
Cit	tation				Recommendation:
FTE	B Notice				File 1 – Beckett

Atty

Sharon, Randolph M., sole practitioner of Agoura Hills (for Petitioner Wells Fargo Bank, Trustee)

#### **Petition for Orders Regarding Trustee's Fees**

Age: 6 years DOB: 2/25/2006				
Coı	nt. from			
	Aff.Sub.Wit.			
✓	Verified			
	Inventory			
	PTC			
	Not.Cred.			
✓	Notice of			
	Hrg			
✓	Aff.Mail	W/		
	Aff.Pub.			
	Sp.Ntc.			
	Pers.Serv.			
	Conf. Screen			
	Letters			
	Duties/Supp			
	Objections			
	Video			
	Receipt			
	CI Report			
	9202			
✓	Order			
	Aff. Posting			
	Status Rpt			
	UCCJEA			
	Citation			
	FTB Notice			

WELLS FARGO BANK, Trustee of the ISAAC GAMEZ SPECIAL NEEDS TRUST, is Petitioner.

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court authorize it to take interim fees on account in accordance with its normal published fee schedule, based upon the following:

- The *Order Approving Creation of Special Needs Trust* signed 4/15/2008 provides:
  - o "The Trustee is entitled to just and reasonable compensation to be determined by the Court, but the Trustee is authorized to make periodic payments on account to itself in the amount specified in its special needs trust fee schedule in existence from time to time, save and except for the following:
    - (A) Payments on account to the Trustee shall be limited to .75% of the fair market value of the Trust assets. This does not limit the Trustee's ability to request payments pursuant to the fee schedule agreed upon by Isaac Gamez' Guardian Ad Litem [Jose Manuel Gamez, Cindy Gamez, and Bruce G. Fagel, APC, per *Order Approving Compromise of Disputed Claim* dated 10/4/2007], as set forth in the *Petition*;
    - The Trustee is not authorized to charge any minimum fee."
- The Trustee's normal published fee schedule (attached as Exhibit A) indicates the Trustee's normal published fee is 1.5% on the first \$2,000,000.00; 1.05% on the next \$3,000,000.00; .85% on assets over \$5,000,000.00;

~Please see additional page~

**NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:** 

Note: Proposed order finds the Trustee is authorized to take interim fees on account in accordance with its normal published fee schedule; a proposed order for the alternative of Trustee resignation and successor appointment was not submitted.

Reviewed by: LEG
Reviewed on: 3/5/12
Updates: 3/9/12
Recommendation:
File 2 - Gamez

## First Additional Page 2, Isaac Gamez Special Needs Trust Case No. 07CEPR01097

#### Bases of Petitioner's request for interim fees on account per fee schedule, continued:

- Pursuant to the *Order* [on the First] Account Current of Trustee for the Period of April 1, 2008 to March 31/2009; Approval of Trustee's Fees; Approval of Attorney of Attorney's Fees dated 3/8/2010, the Court authorized the Trustee to pay itself additional sums, which when added to the sums already received by the Trustee, total the Trustee's normal published fee.
- Pursuant to the Order for Approval of Second Account Current of Trustee for the Period of April 1, 2008 to March 31, 2009; Approval of Trustee's Fees; Approval of Attorney of Attorney's Fees dated 7/25/2011 [signed by Judge Hamilton], the Court did not allow any additional fees for services rendered during the period of the Second Account;
- Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court authorize it to take interim fees on account in accordance with its normal published fee schedule, and requests the Court consider the following Trustees' statement concerning the eight factors of **CA Rule of Court 7.776** in determining or approving compensation to the Trustee:
  - 1. **The gross income of the Trust estate** During the [Second] Account period, the gross receipts were \$160,224.82 and the gains totaled \$55,294.96; this was the result of 350 individual transactions that the Trustee was responsible for verifying, receiving and investing.
  - 2. The success or failure of the Trustee's administration The administration of the Trust during the period of the [Second] Account was successful; Paragraph C (at pages 1 and 2) of the Trust provides that "the intent and purpose of this trust is to provide a discretionary, spendthrift trust, to supplement public resources and benefits when such resources and benefits are unavailable or insufficient to provide for the Special Needs of the Beneficiary." Petitioner respectfully submits that it complied with the said intent and purpose of the Trust by investing the Trust assets, and distributing such assets for the special needs of the Beneficiary.
  - 3. Any unusual skill, expertise, or experience brought to the Trustee's work The administration of a trust for the benefit of a disabled minor beneficiary requires special skill; the trust officers in charge of this matter have over 30 years' experience in connection with the administration of special needs trusts.
  - **4.** The fidelity or disloyalty shown by the Trustee The Trustee had administered this Trust with fidelity and loyalty to the Beneficiary.
  - 5. The amount of risk and responsibility assumed by the Trustee The Trust has assets of over \$1,000,000.00. State and Federal Bank regulating authorities require that a corporate fiduciary set appropriate investment objectives based upon the needs of the Beneficiary; Petitioner has complied with said requirements; Petitioner was responsible for the investment of the Trust assets, as well as insuring that all necessary and appropriate disbursements have been made according to the terms of the Trust; in addition, Petitioner was responsible for federal and state fiduciary income tax returns and the subject accounting to the court; Petitioner maintains a computer system, which provides daily investment balances for each account and which list the transactions occurring daily; the Petitioner's administrator reviews each report to determine if action needs to be taken; Petitioner maintains files for correspondence, bills and receipts, tax, investments and legal documents.
  - **6.** The time spent in the performance of the Trustee's duties Petitioner does not keep time records of its time spent on this matter; Petitioner believes that virtually all of the corporate Trustees of Special Needs Trusts or Settlement Trusts receive their fees on a percentage of the assets under management; none of these institutions charge on an hourly basis for their regular trust services, and if required to do so, would most likely resign; by charging a percentage of the assets, this frees the Beneficiary and his family from concerns regarding being assessed a fee charged to the Trust every time a call or request is made.

~Please see additional page~

#### Second Additional Page 2, Isaac Gamez Special Needs Trust Case No. 07CEPR01097

Bases of Petitioner's request for interim fees on account per fee schedule, continued:

- 7. The custom in the community where the court is located regarding compensation authorized by settlors, compensation allowed by the court, or charges or corporate trustees for trusts of similar size and complexity – The published fee schedules related to the administration of trusts of Westamerica Bank [1.50%] on the First \$1,000,000.00; 1.25% on the Next \$1,000,000.00; 1.00% on asset values above \$2,000,000.00]; **Bank of the West** [1.30% on the First \$1,000,000.00; 1.15% on the Next \$1,000,000.00; .90% the Next \$3,000,000.00; .70% on the Next \$5,000,000.00; negotiated balances for greater than \$10,000,000.00]; US **Bank** [1.35% on the First \$1,000,000.00; .85% on the Next \$2,000,000.00; .70% the Next \$2,000,000.00; .60% on the balance of assets;]; Citizens Business Bank [1.50% annual fee based on market value; annual minimum fee is \$7,500.00]; Merrill Lynch [1.25% on the First \$1,000,000.00; 1.00% on the Next \$1,000,000.00; .80% the Next \$2,000,000.00; .70% on the Next \$6,000,000.00; .60% on more than \$10,000,000.00]; City National **Bank** [1.20% on the First \$1,000,000.00; 1.00% on the Next \$4,000,000.00; .65% the Next \$5,000,000.00; .50% in excess of \$10,000,000.00;] and Northern Trust [1.85% on the First \$1,000,000.00; 1.65% on the Next \$2,000,000.00; 1.50% the Next \$2,000,000.00; accounts over \$5,000,000.00 will be priced on a negotiated basis] (attached as Exhibit B) show clearly that it is the custom of the community to charge percentage compensation; and that the amount charged by the Petitioner is what is typically charged by other financial institutions;
- **8.** Whether the work performed was routine, or required more than ordinary skill or judgment Petitioner believes that the administration of trusts for the benefit of disabled beneficiaries are generally far more complex and involve substantially more time than other inter vivos or testamentary trusts.
- For all of the above reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court allow the Trustee to pay itself fees on account in accordance with its normal published fee schedule;
- Petitioner is unwilling to continue to serve as Trustee based on a Trustee fee of .75%, which Petitioner respectfully submits is an inadequate fee;
- Petitioner respectfully submits that if the Court were to appoint a private professional fiduciary, the cost of bond (which is not required where a bank is serving as Trustee) and the investment fee (which is typically in excess of 1.0%) is likely to exceed the Trustee's normal published fee, without even taking into account the amount charged by the private professional fiduciary;
- If the Court is unwilling to increase the Trustee's fee to its normal published fee, Petitioner tenders its resignation and requests that the Court accept its resignation and appoint a successor trustee.

#### Petitioner prays for an Order of the Court:

- 1. That the Trustee is authorized to take interim fees on account in accordance with its normal published fee schedule; or in the alternative
- 2. That the Court accepts the Petitioner's resignation as Trustee and appoints a successor trustee.

## The Anderson Family Living Trust

3

Atty

Case No. 09CEPR01013

Atty Keeler, William (for Donna Hanneman – Trustee)

Martinez, Vincent T. (for David Anderson, John Anderson, and Joy Jackman -Petitioners)

Petition for Distribution of Trust Income and Principal; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof

Age			DAVID ANDERSON, JOHN D. ANDERSON, AND JOY ANDERSON JACKMAN, beneficiaries, are	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMEN
DO	DOD:		Petitioners.	TS:
			Petitioners request a Court order:	
Cor	nt. from	ı	<u>1)</u> instructing Trustee Donna Hanneman ("Trustee") to distribute trust income and principal of the Exemption	
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		Trust pursuant to the terms of the Anderson Family Living	
	Verified	х	Trust dated 11/23/92 ("Family Trust") and	
	Inventory		<u>2)</u> removing Trustee as the Trustee of the Exemption Trust	
	PTC		and appointed Petitioner Joy Anderson Jackman as	
	Not.Cred.		Successor Trustee of the Exemption Trust, pursuant to the terms of the Family Trust.	
٧	Notice of		terms of the Palmiy Trust.	
	Hrg		I. Petitioners' Request for Order to Instruct	
٧	Aff.Mail	w/o	Trustee to Distribute Exemption Trust Income	
	Aff.Pub.		and Principal	
	Sp.Ntc.		Petitioners state:	
	Pers.Serv.		1. They are 3 of the 6 Family Trust beneficiaries ( <i>Copies</i>	
	Conf. Screen		of the Family Trust and Amendments 1-4 are attached	
	Letters		to Petition);	
	Duties/Supp		2. Trust John Anderson died 12/15/95, at which time the	
	Objections		Family Trust was split into the Marital Trust and the Exemption Trust;	
	Video		3. Surviving Settlor Edna Anderson made several	
	Receipt		amendments to the Marital Trust during her lifetime,	
	CI Report		and she died on 7/19/09;	
	9202		4. Petitioners have made several requests to the Trustee to	
	Order	Х	distribute the Trust income and principal according to the Family Trust, however, Trustee has failed to	
	Aff. Posting		distribute said income;	Reviewed by: NRN
	Status Rpt		5. The corpus of the Exemption Trust, at the time of	Reviewed on: 3/2/12
	UCCJEA .		Edna's death, consisted of mutual funds, commercial	Updates: 3/12/12
	Citation		real estate and a promissory note, as well as a checking	Recommendation:
	FTB Notice		<ul><li>account held at Wells Fargo Bank;</li><li>Petitioners therefore request the Court order Trustee to</li></ul>	File 3 - Anderson
			comply with the terms of the Family Trust and	
			distribute the Exemption Trust income to its	
			beneficiaries.	
			SEE ATTACHED PAGE	
<u> </u>		<u> </u>	SEE MI INCHED I NOE	

## II. Petitioners' Request for Removal of Trustee and Appointment of Petitioner Joy Jackman as Successor Trustee

#### **Petitioners state:**

- 1. Trustors John and Edna ("Trustors") appointed 3 separate individuals as successor trustees of the Family Trust in the event of Trustors' deaths;
- 2. Trustors did not appoint Donna Hanneman as a successor trustee of the Exemption Trust;
- 3. After John's death in 1995, Edna made changes to the Marital Trust and appointed Donna Hanneman as Successor Trustee of the Marital Trust:
- 4. Since Edna's death in 2009, Donna Hanneman has been acting as the Successor Trustee of both the Marital and Exemption Trust;
- 5. Trustee submitted an accounting of the Exemption Trust for the period of 7/19/09 through 4/30/11; Schedule D of that accounting shows no income or principle distributions to the Exemption Trust beneficiaries in over two years;
- 6. Per the Family Trust terms, Kaye Cooper was to have been appointed as first successor trustee of the Exemption Trust;
- 7. Kaye Cooper passed away on 10/26/09;
- 8. Therefore, Richard Cooper should have been appointed, pursuant to the Family Trust; if Richard Cooper was unable or unwilling to act, then Petitioner Joy Anderson Jackman should have been appointed;
- 9. Instead, Donna Hanneman has been acting as the Successor Trustee since 2009; this is erroneous as she was not originally appointed as such by the Trustors;
- 10. Therefore, Trustee Hanneman should be removed as Trustee of the Exemption Trust and either Richard Cooper or Petitioner Joy Anderson Jackman appointed (*note: the prayer and proposed order specifically request that Joy Anderson Jackman be appointed*).

<u>Note</u>: Also filed in support of Petition are signed statements from heirs Jennifer Sharp and Cindy Wischerman, stating they are in agreement with the Petition.

## 4 Lora S. Wilson (Estate) Atty Boyajian, Thomas M. (for Sally

**Case No. 11CEPR00315** 

Boyajian, Thomas M. (for Sally Kathleen Ellis – Daughter – Administrator)

(1) Petition for Final Settlement and Final Distribution, Waiver of Account, Waiver o Statutory Fees for Administrator, and (2) for Allowance of Fees for Attorney (Prob. C. 11600, 10800, 10810, 10831, 10951, 10954)

DOD:	12-2-10		SALLY KATHLEEN ELLIS, Daughter and	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
			Administrator with Full IAEA without	,
			bond, is Petitioner.	
			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
			Accounting is waived.	
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		10 4 4407 000 00	
~	Verified		1&A: \$125,000.00	
~	Inventory		POH: \$125,000.00 (real property only)	
>	PTC		Administrator (Statutory): Waived	
>	Not.Cred.		riammstrator (Statutory). Walved	
N/A	Notice of		Attorney: \$3,500.00 (Less than statutory)	
	Hrg			
N/A	Aff.Mail		Distribution pursuant to intestate	
	Aff.Pub.		succession:	
	Sp.Ntc.			
	Pers.Serv.		Sally Kathleen Ellis: Entire estate	
	Conf. Screen		consisting of real property only	
>	Letters	5-17-11		
	Duties/Supp			
	Objections			
	Video			
	Receipt			
	CI Report			
>	9202			
~	Order			
	Aff. Posting			Reviewed by: skc
	Status Rpt			Reviewed on: 3-2-12
	UCCJEA			Updates:
<u> </u>	Citation			Recommendation: SUBMITTED
~	FTB Notice			File 4 - Wilson

Tomassian, Gerald M. (for Marianne Goode and Joyce L. Serpa – Co-Executors)

(1) Waiver of Accounting and (2) Petition for Final Distribution Under Will and for (3 Allowance of Statutory Attorney's Fees (Prob. C. 11640, 10810)

DO	D: 4-5-11		AMADIANNIC COOR and lover L CERRA	
וטטו	J: 4-5-11		MARIANNE GOODE and JOYCE L. SERPA,	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
			Daughters and Co-Executors with Full IAEA	
			without bond, are Petitioners.	
			A	
			Accounting is waived.	
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		   I&A: \$148,316.59	
<b>&gt;</b>	Verified		POH: \$148,426.78	
>	Inventory		7011. \$140,420.76	
>	PTC		Co-Executors (Statutory): Waived	
<b>&gt;</b>	Not.Cred.		, ,,,	
<b>&gt;</b>	Notice of		Attorney (Statutory): \$5,449.50	
	Hrg			
<b>&gt;</b>	Aff.Mail	W/O	Closing: \$500.00	
	Aff.Pub.			
	Sp.Ntc.		Distribution pursuant to Decedent's will:	
	Pers.Serv.			
	Conf. Screen		Marianne Goode and Joyce L. Serpa as	
<b>&gt;</b>	Letters	6-28-11	Successor Trustees of the Levon Goode	
	<b>Duties/Supp</b>		Revocable Living Trust Agreement dated 9-9-10: \$142,477.28	
	Objections		10: \$142,477.28	
	Video			
	Receipt			
	CI Report			
<b>&gt;</b>	9202			
<b>&gt;</b>	Order			
	Aff. Posting			Reviewed by: skc
	Status Rpt			Reviewed on: 3-2-12
	UCCJEA			Updates:
	Citation			Recommendation: SUBMITTED
~	FTB Notice			File 5 – Goode

Willet, James A. (for Susan M. Fleming – Executor – Petitioner)

(1) First and Final Report of Executor on Waiver of Accounting and (2) Petition for Final Distribution of Estate and (3) for Order Authorizing and Directing Payment of Statutory Executor's Compensation and Statutory Attorneys' Compensation

and

#### Costs

Atty

DOI	D: 6-3-11		SUSAN M. FLEMING, Executor with Full	NE	EDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
			IAEA without bond, is Petitioner.		
			Accounting is waived.	1.	Need revised order pursuant to Local Rule 7.6.1.A. Monetary distributions must be stated in dollars.
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		I&A: \$824,519.34 POH: \$823,260.26 (cash and securities)		
~	Verified		(		
~	Inventory		Executor (Statutory): \$18,927.36		
~	PTC				
~	Not.Cred.		Attorney (Statutory): \$18,927.36		
~	Notice of				
	Hrg		Costs: \$894.00 (filing, publication, certified		
~	Aff.Mail	W	letters, appraisal, etc.)		
	Aff.Pub.				
	Sp.Ntc.		Distribution pursuant to Decedent's will		
	Pers.Serv.		and codicils:		
	Conf. Screen		5 1 1 2 2 3 4 5 1 2		
~	Letters	8-	Equal shares to Susan M. Fleming,		
		4-	Mimi S. Rogers, and Stephen H. Schmid		
		11			
	Duties/Supp				
	Objections				
	Video				
-	Receipt				
	CI Report				
<b>×</b>	9202				
~	Order				
	Aff. Posting				viewed by: skc
-	Status Rpt				viewed on: 3-2-12
	UCCJEA				dates: 3-9-12
	Citation				commendation:
~	FTB Notice			File	e 6 - Costa

Atty Atty Case No. 11CEPR00828

Virgil A. Lininger Irrevocable Trust

Case No. 11CEPR00

Laird, Scott D. (of Wanger Jones Helsey PC, for Sarah Nardone)

Sanoian, Joanne (for Robert Jones, Conservator, and Virgil A. Lininger, Conservatee)

Notice for Ex Parte Hearing and Petition for Order Dissolving Temporary Restraining Order, and Petition to Appoint Independent Counsel

Virgil A. Lininger (93)	SARAH NARDONE, Trust Beneficiary ("Respondent"), is	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
DOB: 10-12-1918	Petitioner herein.	1. Proof of service filed 2-8-12
	╡	reflects mailing of applicable
	Background: ROBERT JONES, Nephew and Conservator	documents only to Petitioners'
	of the Person and Estate of VIRGIL A. LININGER,	attorney Joanne Sanoian.
Aff Code Marie	("Petitioner") together with <b>VIRGIL A. LININGER</b> , filed a	Examiner notes that the
Aff.Sub.Wit.	Petition to Invalidate Irrevocable Trust on 9-14-11. The	mandatory Judicial Council
✓ Verified	hearing on the petition has been continued to 4-10-12.	form "Notice of Hearing –
Inventory	On 12 22 12 the Count grounted Detition of a sympath	Probate" (DE-120) was not
PTC	On 12-22-12, the Court granted Petitioner's ex parte	used and the parties were not
Not.Cred.	application for temporary restraining order pending the	served directly pursuant to Probate Code §§ 1211 and
Notice of Hrg	outcome of the evidentiary hearing on the petition to	1214, and Cal. Rule of Court
✓ Aff.Mail	invalidate the trust that prohibits SARAH NARDONE	7.51. <sup>°</sup>
Aff.Pub.	from making any contact with <b>VIRGIL A. LININGER</b> until	
Sp.Ntc.	the outcome of the evidentiary hearing on the Petition	
Pers.Serv.	to Invalidate Irrevocable Trust.	
Conf. Screen	Desmandant states. This notition is based on Code of	
Letters	Respondent states: This petition is based on Code of	
Duties/Supp	Civil Procedure Sections 527 and 528 on the grounds	
Objections	that the temporary restraining order was improperly	
Video Receipt	issued for an indefinite period of time without an order to show cause and is void as a matter of law, and on	
CI Report	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
9202	the grounds that Ms. Sanoian, counsel for Virgil	
✓ Order	Lininger, has an irreconcilable conflict of interest.	
Aff. Posting	On 12-22-11, the Court granted Petitioner's request for	Reviewed by: skc
Status Rpt	a temporary restraining order without issuing an Order	Reviewed on: 3-5-12
UCCJEA	to Show Cause why a preliminary injunction should not	Updates:
Citation	issue setting a hearing within 15 days. As such, because	Recommendation:
FTB Notice	the temporary restraining order was issued without an	File 7 - Lininger
	Order to Show Cause, thereby depriving Respondent	
	with her rights to due process and an opportunity to be	
	heard, the temporary restraining order is void. Since a	
	noticed motion cannot be heard for over 45 days and	
	Respondent has been denied her rights to due process	
	under a void order, ex parte application is appropriate.	
	under a void order, ex parte application is appropriate.	
	Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of	
	Ex Parte Petition for Order Dissolving Temporary	
	Restraining Order; and Petition for Court to Appoint	
	Independent Counsel filed 2-7-12 states:	
	independent counsel med 2 / 12 states.	
	SEE PAGE 2	

#### 7 Virgil A. Lininger Irrevocable Trust Case No. 11CEPR00828

#### Page 2 of 5

Intro/Summary: Respondent states the TRO issued without a hearing and on an ex parte basis before Respondent could even get an opposition filed <u>must</u> be dissolved. An Order to Show Cause hearing <u>must</u> follow the issuance of a Temporary Restraining Order. Because the Court did not issue an Order to Show Cause returnable within 15 days and set hearing as required by C.C.P. §527(d)(1), thereby depriving Respondent of her due process, the Temporary Restraining Order is void and must be dissolved [emphasis in original].

Respondent states that well after Virgil established the trust for Sarah, Virgil's nephew Robert Jones filed for conservatorship. Attorney Joanne Sanoian, as court-appointed independent counsel, represented Virgil in the conservatorship petition and was adverse to Robert Jones as petitioner therein. Attorney Sanoian now represents Robert Jones and Virgil in this action.

Respondent states that in the conservatorship case, Attorney Sanoian submitted a declaration stating Virgil was resolute and that the trust not be disturbed. The result of the conservatorship case was a Mutual Release and Settlement Agreement wherein: 1) Robert would become Virgil's conservator; 2) Virgil would not oppose, interfere, object, resist, or contest any legal action brought or filed by Petitioner to revoke the trust established in favor of Sarah, and 3) all funds recovered from the trust would be deposited in Trust A – Survivor's Trust of the Virgil A. Lininger and Katherine E. Lininger Revocable Trust dated September 15, 2004 ("Trust A"). Now, Ms. Sanoian, representing both Robert and Virgil, seeks to revoke the trust, contrary to Virgil's clearly expressed wishes. Under the circumstances, the Court should appoint independent counsel for Virgil.

**Parties/Pleadings:** Respondent Sarah states she and Virgil were and are close personal friends who traveled together extensively and spent extended periods of time together, and Sarah is the beneficiary of the Virgil A. Lininger Irrevocable Trust created 1-20-11.

After settling the conservatorship petition, Petitioner filed a petition to invalidate the trust. Respondent objected. Petitioner then filed an ex parte application for the temporary restraining order enjoining Sarah from contacting Virgil until the outcome of the evidentiary hearing on the petition to invalidate the trust and enjoining Sarah from taking any action, in the event of the demise of Virgil, to claim the assets held. Petitioner based the TRO on the grounds that Sarah may attempt to influence Virgil regarding the pending action.

The judge granted the indefinite temporary restraining order without a hearing and before Respondent could even get an opposition on file. However, the Court did not issue, nor did the Petitioner request, an Order to Show Cause Why a Preliminary Injunction should not be granted. There was no hearing on a preliminary injunction. In addition, the Court granted the Ex Parte TRO without any finding of great or irreparable injury that would result to Virgil before the matter could be heard on notice.

**Legal Analysis:** Ex Parte relief is appropriate with reference to *In re Berry* (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 137, 148-149. While confident that that TRO was issued by this court in excess of its jurisdiction and is therefore void, Respondent has decided to challenge its validity rather than violating its terms. However, since 12-22-11, Respondent's liberty and freedom of association have been enjoined and her rights to due process violated pursuant to the terms of a void order. Since noticed motion cannot be heard for 45 days and Respondent's constitutional rights have already been violated for 45 days, ex parte relief is appropriate.

The Court's issuance of the TRO was improper and would have only been effective until a hearing on the preliminary injunction on an order to show cause pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §528. A temporary restraining order is issued through the procedure set forth in C.C.P. §527 and is only temporary until Respondent can be heard after being served with an order to show cause.

#### **SEE PAGE 3**

### 7 Virgil A. Lininger Irrevocable Trust Case No. 11CEPR00828

#### Page 3 of 5

Respondent cites *Landmark Holding Group v. Superior Court* (1987) 193 C.A.3d 525, 529): "The issuance of the temporary restraining order does not determine the merits of the controversy. The order merely maintains the status quo until the hearing on the application for the preliminary injunction."

- Cal. Rules of Ct., 3.1150(a): An order to show cause must be used when a temporary restraining order is sought.
- C.C.P. §527(d)(1): After a TRO is granted, the matter must be made returnable on an order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not be granted on the earliest date the court can hear the matter but not later than 15 days from the date the TRO is issued.
- McDonald v. Superior Court (1937) 18 Cal. App. 2d. 652, Agricultural Prorate Commission v. The Superior Court of Riverside County (1939) 30 Cal. App. 2d 154, 155): If an order to show cause is set for hearing beyond this statutory time period, the order to show cause is void. (Court was without jurisdiction to hear or determine application for injunction for the reason that the order to show cause was issued beyond statutory deadline.)

The Court granted Petitioner's request and issued TRO without a hearing; however, unlike the cases cited above where an OSC was issued, albeit outside the statutory deadline, and contrary to the statutory framework enacted to provide Respondent with due process, the Court did not even issue an OSC in this case. The Court allowed Petitioner to circumvent a very important step, allowing Respondent to be heard after being served with an OSC to allow Respondent to respond with her own evidence and defense before being ordered to refrain from contacting Virgil or accessing approx. \$750,000.00 should Virgil pass during this action.

Under C.C.P. §527, Respondent has a right to present affidavits and have an opportunity to be heard. This is the due process that is required before restraining Respondent's conduct and potentially her rightful access to the trust corpus, and she was denied that due process. The court lacks the jurisdiction to issue any TRO longer than the prescribed 15 days. Therefore, the court lacked the power to make such an order, and the TRO is void and should therefore be dissolved.

**Respondent further requests** that the Court appoint independent counsel for Virgil Lininger in this litigation. In her advocacy for Mr. Lininger in the conservatorship case, Ms. Sanoian clearly expressed and advocated his unequivocal desire and wish that the trust that is the subject of this litigation not be disturbed. Now, she is taking the exact opposite position and on behalf of Petitioner Jones is seeking to revoke the trust. If Lininger is in a weakened mental or physical state, there is no way his true wishes can be validated with the same lawyer representing him and also representing Jones.

Further, there appears to be actual conflict of interest between Virgil and Petitioner: In the conservatorship proceeding, Virgil expressed his desire to keep the trust intact for the benefit of Sarah. At this time, Ms. Sanoian was Virgil's counsel. As part of the Settlement Agreement in the conservatorship proceeding, all funds recovered from the trust will be deposited to Trust A.

Respondent believes that Petitioner is one of the beneficiaries of Trust A. Ms. Sanoian is representing both Virgil and Petitioner in this proceeding. Therefore, there is an actual conflict of interest between what Virgil has stated that he desires and the pecuniary interest of her other client, Petitioner herein.

**Conclusion:** Respondent was denied her due process rights when the court granted the TRO without providing an opportunity to be heard. Petitioner did not follow the statutory procedure, and a TRO must be issued with an OSC. Therefore, the order is void and should be formally dissolved by the Court.

It is clear that Ms. Sanoian cannot represent the interests of both Petitioner and Virgil in this matter. There is an actual conflict between the two parties' interests. Respondent respectfully requests the Court appoint independent legal counsel for Virgil.

#### **SEE PAGE 4**

#### 7 Virgil A. Lininger Irrevocable Trust Case No. 11CEPR00828

#### Page 4 of 5

Supplemental Objection to Nardone's Ex Parte Petition for Order Dissolving Temporary Restraining Order; and Petition to Appoint Independent Counsel for Virgil Lininger filed 3-8-12 states:

Nardone mistakenly argues that pursuant to CCP 527(d)(1) and Rules of Court 3.1150(a) the TRO granted 12-22-11 should be voided because an order to show cause was not set within the prescribed period of time.

CCP 527(d)(1) does not apply in this case. CCP 527(d)(1) states:

"(d) In case a temporary restraining order is granted without notice in the contingency specified in subdivision (c):

(1) The matter shall be made returnable on an order requiring cause to be shown why a preliminary injunction should not be granted, on the earliest day that the business of the court will admit of, but not later than 15 days or, if good cause appears to the court, 22 days from the date the temporary restraining order is issued." (emphasis added)

Subdivision (c) then states that "That for reasons specified the applicant should not be required to so inform the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney."

On 12-20-11, Nardone's counsel was informed via telephone call at 9:25 am and again via email at 10:00 am of the date, time, and place the ex parte application would be made, and the specific nature of the relief sought (See paragraphs 1-3 of the filed Declaration of Maria Vega Regarding Notice of Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order Pending Outcome of the Hearing (copy attached).

A copy of the ex parte application for the TRO and all documents filed with it were faxed to Nardone's counsel on 12-21-11. Petitioner did in fact give notice pursuant to CCP 527(c)(2)(A).

Since Nardone's counsel was given notice of the date, time and place of the TRO application pursuant to the above requirements, then subdivision (c) does not apply and therefore we do not look to subdivision (d)(1).

CRC 3.1150(a) also does not apply to this matter. That rule states that "[a] party requesting preliminary injunction may give notice of the request to the opposing or responding party either by being served a noticed motion under Code of Civil Procedure section 1005 or by obtaining and serving an order to show cause (OSC)."

Petitioner did not request a preliminary injunction in this matter; Petitioner filed an ex parte application for temporary restraining order pending the outcome of the hearing.

Nardone should have looked to CFC 3.1150(g) as it applies specifically to Application for Ex Parte Restraining Orders and states that "[a]pplications for ex parte temporary restraining orders are governed by the ex parte rules in chapter 4 of this division.

Pursuant to chapter 4, the parte seeking the ex parte order has to notify the parties no later than 10:00 am the court day before the application is made. On 12-20-11, Nardone's counsel was informed via telephone call at 9:25 am and again via email at 10:00 am of the date, time and place the ex parte application would be made, and the specific nature of the relief sought. A copy of all documents filed was faxed to Nardone's counsel on 12-21-11.

Nardone's counsel had notice pursuant to the above requirements, and Petitioner satisfied all of the ex parte notice requirements pursuant to CRC 3.1150(g), 3.1203 and 3.1204. The court found that the facts in this matter warranted the granting of the TRO in December 2011 and those facts have not changed.

**SEE PAGE 5** 

#### Page 5 of 5

Nardone's argument that her "liberty and freedom of association have been enjoined" since the issuance of the TRO is nonsensical. Petitioner is unclear as to what freedoms and liberty she has exactly lost. Nardone cannot access funds while Virgil is still living and her counsel agreed to stipulate not to take any action relative to the assets of the trust. Petitioner is confused as to why Nardone believes she has the freedom and right to have contact with Virgil when he is under a conservatorship and stated he didn't want to see her. Furthermore, she has not seen him since 2-14-11 and has made no attempts to visit him before the TRO was signed.

"The clear purpose of the restraining order is to hold the subject of litigation in status quo until its final determination." (Marolda v. La Piner (1947) 81 Cal. Appl. 2d 742, 745)

Since Nardone could not access the funds from the trust and did not attempt to contact Virgil prior to the TRO being signed, the TRO does in fact maintain the status quo and should remain in effect.

#### Regarding Petition for appointment of independent counsel:

Joanne Sanoian was court-appointed and continues to be counsel for Virgil in the conservatorship proceedings. In Virgil's declaration, he states he objects to appointment of independent counsel and wants Attorney Sanoian to remain as his attorney in this matter.

Virgil is not a party to this action and agreed that the conservator could file the current proceedings to revoke the trust. Nardone insinuates that the settlement agreement does not represent Virgil's desires. Virgil signed the settlement agreement with the independent advice of his court appointed counsel and of his own free will.

Virgil was deemed unavailable as a witness for all purposes by this court on 1-13-12.

Nardone makes an argument that due to some "irreconcilable" conflict, Sanoian can no longer represent Virgil, yet she never explains why or cites any law. Nardone makes various incorrect assumptions in her argument. As stated above, Virgil is neither a party nor witness in this proceeding. Petitioner and Virgil both agreed to initiation of the petition in this proceeding, agreed to the establishment of conservatorship, and agreed to the TRO. There is no current conflict. Virgil was an attorney for over 42 years and stated that he fully understands the "potential conflict" that may arise from Joanne Sanoian's representation of him in both proceedings, but explained that he has no objection to Joanne Sanoian continuing to represent both him and the conservator.

Conclusion: Because Petitioner and the Court followed all propert statutes and procedures at the time Petitioner's ex parte application for TRO was presented to and signed by the Court, the TRO should remain in effect and Petitioner requests that Nardone's petition for an order dissolving the TRO be denied in its entirety.

Virgil Lininger is neither a witness nor a party to this action and clearly accepts Attorney Sanoian as his counsel in the conservatorship action. Petitioner requests that Nsardone's petition for appointment for Virgil Lininger in this action also be denied in its entirety.

Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust) 8A

Case No. 11CEPR01018

Keeler, William J. (for Roberto Garcia – beneficiary/Petitioner) Atty Phillips, John W. (for Evelyn Lauderdale – Trustee) Atty

Petition to Remove Trustee and for Appointment of Successor Trustee; (2) for Surcharge of Trustee; (3) for Order directing Trustee to Return Trust Property to Trust; (4) and for Order Compelling Trustee to Account and Report [Prob. C. §§ 850, 15642, 16064, 17200(b)]

DOD: 06/29/11	ROBERTO GARCIA, Trust Beneficiary, is Petitioner.	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
Cont. from 01/10/12, 022812  Aff.Sub.Wit.  Verified Inventory PTC Not.Cred.  Notice of Hrg  Aff.Mail Aff.Pub. Sp.Ntc. Pers.Serv. Conf. Screen Letters Duties/Supp Objections Video Receipt CI Report 9202  Order Aff. Posting Status Rpt UCCJEA Citation FTB Notice	Petitioner states:  1. Decedent created the Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (the "Trust") and a pour-over Will on August 23, 2007;  2. Decedent amended the Trust on July 1, 2009 (the "First Amendment");  3. Decedent amended the Trust a second time on December 15, 2009 (the "Second Amendment");  4. Decedent amended the Trust a third and final time on December 13, 2010;  5. Decedent died on June 29, 2011, at which time the Trust became irrevocable;  6. Petitioner is a named beneficiary of the Trust and also was nominated as second successor trustee in the Third Amendment to the Trust;  7. Petitioner states that Evelyn Lauderdale is the current acting trustee;  8. Petitioner states that Evelyn Lauderdale is a contingent beneficiary only, in that she succeeds to the personal property of the Trust only in the event the decedent did not leave a letter of instructions governing the distribution of such property;  9. Petitioner states that Evelyn Lauderdale was present when decedent discussed her estate planning with her attorney as was aware that she was solely a contingent beneficiary and successor trustee of the Trust;  10. Petitioner states that Evelyn Lauderdale was a coowner of a Chase bank account with the decedent due to the decedent needing assistance in paying bills as her health declined;  11. Petitioner states that decedent owned investment accounts with Merrill Lynch, John Hancock, and Wells Fargo Financial either individually or in her capacity as trustee of the Trust and Petitioner understands that certain individuals, including the Petitioner, were pay-on-death beneficiaries of one of more of these accounts;  12. Petitioner states that Evelyn Lauderdale was not an authorized signer on any of these accounts;  See Page 2 for more information	Reviewed by: JF Reviewed on: 03/06/12 Updates: Recommendation: File 8A - Shubin

## 8A Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust)

Page 2

Case No. 11CEPR01018

- 13. Petitioner states that in or around May 2011, while the decedent was in the hospital, Evelyn Lauderdale went to Merrill Lynch, John Hancock, and Wells Fargo Financial, and using a durable power of attorney signed by decedent, transferred between \$150,000.00 \$250,000.00 from the decedent's investment accounts into the Chase account she co-owned with the decedent;
- 14. Petitioner states that the decedent did not know about and did not authorize Ms. Lauderdale to make such transfers;
- 15. Petitioner states that upon the decedent's death, the funds in the Chase account reverted to Ms. Lauderdale by operation of law;
- 16. Petitioner states that after decedent's death, Ms. Lauderdale closed the Chase account without any accountings having been given to the decedent before her death or to any other person with an interest in the funds, including the Petitioner or other pay-on-death beneficiaries of the investment accounts;
- 17. Petitioner states that he does not know what happened to the funds that were in the Chase account when Ms. Lauderdale closed the account;
- 18. Petitioner states that Ms. Lauderdale's removal of the funds from the decedent's accounts, without the decedent's knowledge or consent, constituted fraud on the decedent and on the intended beneficiaries of the accounts, including the beneficiaries of the Trust;
- 19. Petitioner states that as a result of her wrongful conduct, Ms. Lauderdale has breached her duties as successor trustee of the Trust and holds funds removed from the investment accounts;
- 20. Petitioner states that Ms. Lauderdale should be removed as trustee of the Trust and should be made to account and report for the funds she took from decedent's investment accounts and for her administration of the Trust estate;
- 21. Petitioner further states that Ms. Lauderdale, as successor trustee of the Trust, has a fiduciary duty to administer the Trust according to the Trust Instrument and applicable law, keep trust property separate from other property not subject to the Trust and see that the Trust property is designated as property of the Trust;
- 22. Further, Petitioner states that the Ms. Lauderdale, as successor trustee of the Trust, has a duty to keep the beneficiaries of the Trust reasonably informed of the Trust and its administration;
- 23. Petitioner alleges that Ms. Lauderdale has taken possession of Trust property and titled it in her own name individually. This property includes, but is not limited to, the funds taken from decedent's investment accounts;
- 24. Petitioner alleges that Ms. Lauderdale intentionally chose to act to her own benefit instead of to the benefit of the beneficiaries of the Trust, all contrary to her duties and responsibilities as successor trustee;
- 25. Petitioner also states that Ms. Lauderdale, in her capacity as successor trustee, has intentionally sought to harm Petitioner's interest as a beneficiary of the Trust by bringing a trust contest in the unlimited civil department of Fresno Superior Court (Case No. 11CECG02841), by failing to fully disclose in her pleadings the amendments to the Trust, which grant property to the Petitioner, by failing to disclose the existence of certificates of independent review related to the amendments to the Trust which grant property to the Petitioner, by failing to object to the amendments during the decedent's lifetime despite having been present at the time of their creation, and by seeking a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction against Petitioner enjoining him from accessing the trailer without filing an unlawful detainer action and without disclosing Petitioner's entitlement to that property under the amendments to the Trust;

### 8A Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust)

Page 3

26. Petitioner alleges that by her actions, Ms. Lauderdale has intentionally and willfully breached her fiduciary duties to the beneficiaries of the Trust, including Petitioner, thereby causing damage to the Petitioner and the other Trust beneficiaries;

Case No. 11CEPR01018

#### Petitioner requests an Order:

- 1. Immediately removing Ms. Lauderdale as trustee of the Trust;
- 2. Appointing a neutral third-party as successor trustee;
- 3. Directing Ms. Lauderdale to prepare and file an account and report of her administration of the Trust for the period of May 1, 2011 up to and including her removal as successor trustee of the Trust, and set the account and report for hearing upon proper notice;
- 4. Directing Ms. Lauderdale to turn over to the successor trustee all assets in her possession or control removed from decedent's investment accounts, as well as any other assets properly belonging to the Trust;
- 5. Surcharging Ms. Lauderdale according to proof;
- 6. For damages according to proof;
- 7. For punitive damages in an amount warranted by Ms. Lauderdale's intentional and willful breach of her fiduciary duties;
- 8. For any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Evelyn Lauderdale's Opposition to Petition to Remove Trustee and for Appointment of a Successor Trustee; For Surcharge of Trustee; For Order Directing Trustee to Return Trust Property to Trust; and for order Compelling Trustee to Account and Report filed 01/09/12 states:

Respondent, Evelyn Lauderdale specifically admits and denies the various allegations in the Petition.

Respondent states that she is in the process of preparing the statutory accounting for the Trust and states that the accounting should be finalized by late January or early February 2012. Respondent states that several of the allegations in the Petition are best responded to through the accounting and requests that the court defer ruling on this Petition until the accounting has been finalized and submitted to the parties and the Court.

Respondent states that this Petition is a response to litigation filed against the Petitioner based on his actions regarding the decedent and her assets prior to her death. Respondent alleges in that litigation that Petitioner, in a predatory manner, embarked on a scheme to lull decedent into a sense of security by promising to care for all of her needs, when Petitioner secretly intended to loot decedent, her estate and rightful beneficiaries of the assets of the estate by wrongfully coercing decedent to execute amendments to the Trust.

Respondent states that she is pursuing this litigation on behalf of the Trust to restore assets to the Trust to which omitted beneficiaries contend they are entitled. Respondent states that it is questionable whether a newly appointed "neutral" third party successor trustee would pursue such complex litigation.

Respondent further states that she has not transferred any assets of the Trust, other than as instructed by either the Fresno Police Department, her attorneys, or the decedent prior to her death and on that basis denies the suggestion of impropriety.

## 8A Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust)

Page 4

#### Respondent requests a judgment as follows:

- 1. Denying the Petitioners request to remove Respondent as Trustee;
- 2. Denying the Petitioner's request directing Respondent to prepare and file an account and report for the period beginning May 1, 2011;

Case No. 11CEPR01018

- 3. Denying Petitioner's request that the Respondent turn over all possessions in her control to a successor Trustee;
- 4. Denying Petitioner's request that Respondent be surcharged;
- 5. Denying Petitioner's request for damages;
- 6. Denying Petitioner's request for punitive damages; and
- 7. Any other relief the Court deems proper.

8B Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust)

Case No. 11CEPR01018

Keeler, William J. (for Roberto Garcia – Beneficiary) Atty Atty

Phillips, John W. (for Evelyn Lauderdale - Trustee/Petitioner)

Petition to Determine Validity of Purported First and Third Amendments to Trust and to Impose Constructive Trust (Prob. C. 17200, et seq., 21350, et seq; and 21360 et sea)

DO	D: 06/29/11		EVELYN LAUDERDALE, Trustee of the Jeri L.	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
	<u> </u>		Shubin 2007 Trust, is Petitioner.	
				CONTINUED FROM 02/28/12
			Petitioner alleges:	As of 03/06/12, no new documents
Cor	nt. from 022312	2,	1. Jeri L. Shubin (the "Decedent"), died June 29,	have been filed.
022	2812		2011, a resident of Fresno County, and left property in Fresno County.	1. Need Order.
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		2. On August 23, 2007, Decedent executed a	
✓	Verified		Declaration of Trust known as the Jeri L.	Notes:
	Inventory		Shubin 2007 Trust that called for distribution	Consent to Serve as Neutral Third
	PTC		of its assets as follows:	Party Successor Trustee by Bruce Bickel was filed 02/01/12.
	Not.Cred.		a. Personal property to be distributed	DICKEI WAS IIIEU UZ/U1/12.
✓	Notice of		pursuant to a letter of instruction to the trustee, or in the absence of such a	
	Hrg		letter, in equal shares to James Shubin	
✓	Aff.Mail	w/	and Gary Shubin;	
	Aff.Pub.		b. Real property located at 4104 E.	
	Sp.Ntc.		Washington, Fresno to Rick Davis;	
	Pers.Serv.		c. Any residue, 1/3 to Gary Shubin, 1/3 to	
	Conf. Screen		James Shubin, and 1/3 to various	
	Letters		charities. 3. On July 1, 2009, the Decedent executed a	
	Duties/Supp		document purported to be the first amendment	
✓	Objections		to the trust. This amendment passes personal	
	Video		property to Marlene Gunion in the absence of	
	Receipt		a letter to the Trustee; real property at 4104 E.	
	CI Report		Washington, Fresno to Rick Davis; 31.9 acres	
	9202		of real property to William Buchnoff; real	
	Order	Х	property at 1582 N. Humboldt, a 1991 trailer, a 1997 Ford Explorer, and Bank of America	
	Aff. Posting		bank account ending in 04563 to Roberto	Reviewed by: JF
	Status Rpt		Garcia; and the residue of the estate to be	Reviewed on: 03/06/12
	UCCJEA		divided 1/3 to Gary Shubin (with certain	Updates:
	Citation		restrictions), 1/3 to James Shubin (with certain	Recommendation:
	FTB Notice		restrictions), and \$250,000.00 of the remaining	File 8B - Shubin
			1/3 to charities named in the original trust,	
			<ul><li>with the balance to Roberto Garcia.</li><li>4. On December 15, 2009 the Decedent executed</li></ul>	
			a Second Amendment to her Trust adding a	
			specific distribution of real property located at	
			2045 W. San Ramon, Fresno to Marlene	
			Gunion.	
			Cont'd on Page 2	

### 8B Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust)

Case No. 11CEPR01018

Page 2

- 5. On December 13, 2010, Decedent executed a document purported to be a Third Amendment to her Trust. This Third Amendment revokes the second Amendment and affirms the First, except that it passes the personal property to Petitioner (Evelyn Lauderdale) in the absence of a letter of instruction; passes the 1991 trailer and real property located at 2045 W. San Ramon, Fresno to Roberto Garcia; and passes the residue of the Trust 1/3 to Gary Shubin (with certain restrictions), 1/3 to James Shubin (with certain restrictions), and the remaining 1/3 to the charities originally designated in the Trust.
- **6.** On May 17, 2011, Decedent executed a Fourth Amendment to the Trust which appointed Petitioner to act as Co-Trustee with the Decedent.

Petitioner request that the Court rescind and nullify the purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust on the following grounds:

- A. First Ground: Lack of Capacity
  - 1. At the time of the alleged execution of the purported Trust Amendments, the Decedent was not of sound and disposing mind. The Decedent did not have the sufficient mental capacity to understand the nature of her actions in executing the purported Trusts, understand and recollect the nature and situation of her property, or remember or understand her relationship to her family members.
- B. Second Ground: Undue Influence
  - 1. The purported Trust Amendments were executed as a direct result of undue influence exerted on the Decedent by Roberto Garcia. This undue influence consisted of the following:
    - a. Roberto Garcia was a confidant to the Decedent for approximately 3 years before and up to the time of her death;
    - b. Mr. Garcia had a friendly and confidential relationship with Decedent, who trusted and had confidence in Mr. Garcia;
    - c. Mr. Garcia took over the decedent's financial affairs'
    - d. At the time the amendments were signed and at the time of the Decedent's death, she was aged and infirm, and suffered from memory problems. As a result of these mental infirmities, Decedent was easily influenced and controlled by Mr. Garcia;
    - e. Mr. Garcia actively procured the purported Trust as part of a pattern of conduct aimed at gaining control of the Decedent's major assets;
    - f. During the last few months of the Decedent's life, Mr. Garcia took active steps to isolate Decedent and prevent her from having contact with family members;
    - g. The Trust Amendments confer an undue benefit on Mr. Garcia. Mr. Garcia "moved in" on the Decedent during the last few years of her life, taking over ever greater control of the Decedent's life and financial affairs. Before becoming a confidant to the Decedent, Mr. Garcia had been a stranger to the Decedent.
- C. Third Ground: Duress and Menace
  - 1. The apparent consent of Decedent to the First and Third Amendments to the Trust was obtained by Mr. Garcia's duress and menace. Decedent made statements to persons during the course of executing the purported Amendments that she feared Mr. Garcia and feared not executing the purported Amendments. Petitioner alleges that Mr. Garcia coached and practiced with Decedent what she was supposed to tell the attorney who drafted the purported Amendments, as well as another attorney who executed Independent Certificate of Reviews relating to the Decedent's will. Decedents will passes her entire estate to her Trust. Petitioner states that the Decedent would not have consented to the First and Third Amendments absent the conduct of Mr. Garcia.

## 8B Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust) Case No. 11CEPR01018

Page 3

- D. Fourth Ground: Prohibited Transferee.
  - 1. Probate Code § 21350 et seq. prohibits Mr. Garcia from succeeding to any interest under the purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust as he was a care custodian to the Decedent as defined under Section 15610.7 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, and the Decedent would have been a dependent adult under the definition set forth in Welfare and Institutions Code § 15160.23 had she been between the ages of 18 and 64. Petitioner further alleges that an independent attorney did review the Decedent's will with her, but according to the Certificates of Independent Review, did not review the purported trust amendments with her.

#### E. Fifth Ground: Prohibited Transferee.

- 1. Mr. Garcia is prohibited by Probate Code § 21360 et seq. from succeeding to any interest under the purported first and third amendments to the trust, as he was a care custodian of the Decedent as defined under section 21362 of the Probate Code and the Decedent was a dependent adult as defined under Probate Code § 21366(a). Petitioner alleges that the purported transfers are presumed to be the product of fraud and undue influence by virtue of Probate Code § 21380, subjecting Mr. Garcia to all costs, including reasonable attorney fees, should he fail to rebut the presumption (See Probate Code § 21380(d)).
- 2. Because of the Decedent's lack of capacity, Mr. Garcia's exertion of undue influence, menace and duress over the Decedent, and/or because he was a prohibited transferee, Mr. Garcia holds title to trust assets as well as income therefrom, as constructive trustee for the benefit of persons entitled to distribution of the Decedent's estate. Those assets include cash and other personal property according to proof.

#### Petitioner prays for an order:

- 1. Finding the purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust void due to the mental incapacity of the Decedent;
- 2. Finding the purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust void due to the undue influence of Mr. Garcia;
- 3. Finding the purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust void due to the duress and/or menace of Mr. Garcia over the Decedent;
- 4. Declaring that Mr. Garcia holds any and all assets of the Trust that he has received already in trust, for the person entitled to distribution of the estate of the Decedent;
- 5. For costs of suit herein, including attorney fees, to the extent allowed by law;
- 6. Finding that Mr. Garcia is a prohibited transferee pursuant to Probate Code § 21350 et seq. and invalidating those provisions of the purported first and third Amendments to the Trust that purport to make gifts to Mr. Garcia.

## Objection to Petition to Determine Validity of Purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust and to Impose Constructive Trust filed 02/16/12 by Roberto Garcia denies all of the allegations in the Petition except:

- 1. That the first amendment purports to convey 31.9 acres to William Buchnoff. Mr. Garcia alleges that the first amendment actually purports to convey 39.1 acres to William Buchnof.
- 2. That the fourth amendment purports to appoint Petitioner to act as co-trustee with the Decedent.
- 3. That Mr. Garcia had a friendly relationship with the Decedent.
- 4. That the address for the SPCA stated in the Petition is correct. Mr. Garcia also admits that McCormick Barstow has filed a request for special notice on behalf of the SPCA.

#### Mr. Garcia makes the following affirmative defenses:

1. The Petition and each and every cause of action therein does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against the Respondent.

## 8B Re: Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust) Case No. 11CEPR01018 Page 4

- 2. Petitioner lacks sufficient legal standing to maintain each and every cause of action alleged in the Petition.
- 3. The acts, errors and omissions of Petitioner constitute unclean hands and therefore bar any relief.
- 4. Petitioner is estopped from pursuing the causes of action set forth in the Petition.
- 5. The causes of action stated in the petition were not timely filed and are barred by the applicable statute of limitation set forth by California law, including, but not limited to: the California Code of Civil Procedure, California Civil Code, and the California Probate Code.
- 6. Petitioner has not brought and served in a timely manner but has delayed in bringing and serving suit until a substantial time after the alleged causes of action accrued. This delay worked to the Respondent's prejudice and thus this action and any claim purported therein is barred by the Doctrine of Laches.

#### Respondent prays for a judgment:

- 1. That Petitioner take nothing on the basis of her Petition to Determine the Validity of the Purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust and to impose constructive trust;
- 2. That the first and third amendments be found to be valid trust amendments;
- 3. That the Respondent be awarded costs of suit herein incurred; and
- 4. That the Respondent be awarded reasonable attorneys' fees to the extent permissible by contract or statute.

**8C** Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust)

Case No. 11CEPR01018

Keeler, William J. (for Roberto Garcia – beneficiary/Petitioner) Atty Atty

Phillips, John W. (for Evelyn Lauderdale – Trustee)

Petition for Preliminary Distribution and Injunction (Prob. C. 17200; CCP 526)

	D. 0C/20/11			DEO CARCIA Trees Describing in	
100	D: 06/29/11		Petition	RTO GARCIA, Trust Beneficiary, is	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
			Pennoi	iler.	1. Need Order.
		1	Datition	ner states:	1. Need Older.
				Decedent created the Jeri L. Shubin 2007	
Cor	nt. from		1.	Trust (the "Trust") and a pour-over Will on	
	Aff.Sub.Wit.			August 23, 2007;	
<b>√</b>	Verified		2	Decedent amended the Trust four times during	
			2.	the course of her life, first on July 1, 2009,	
	Inventory			second on December 15, 2009, third on	
	PTC			December 13, 2010, and a final time on May	
	Not.Cred.			27, 2011;	
✓	Notice of		3.	Decedent amended her Will once on	
	Hrg		٥.	December 13, 2010;	
✓	Aff.Mail	w/	4.	Decedent died on June 29, 2011 a resident of	
	Aff.Pub.		••	Fresno County;	
	Sp.Ntc.		5.	Petitioner, Roberto Garcia, was a close friend	
	Pers.Serv.			of Decedent and is a beneficiary of the Trust	
	Conf. Screen	=		pursuant to the First, Second, Third and Fourth	
	<u> </u>			Amendments. Petitioner is also nominated as	
	Letters			the second successor executor in the first	
	Duties/Supp			codicil to the Decedent's Will;	
	Objections		6.	Paragraph 5 of the third amendment to the	
	Video			Trust amends paragraph 6 of the original	
	Receipt			document to include "The Trustee shall	
	CI Report			distribute the real property described in Item	
	9202			No. 1 in Exhibit A attached to the Jeri L.	
	Order	Х		Shubin 2007 Trust, with a common address of	
	Aff. Posting			2045 W. San Ramon, Fresno, California (APN	Reviewed by: JF
	Status Rpt			415-520-44) to Roberto Garcia, if he	Reviewed on: 03/06/12
	UCCJEA		7	survives";	Updates:
	Citation		7.	This specific bequest was no subsequently	Recommendation:
	FTB Notice		0	amended or revoked in the fourth amendment;	File 8C - Shubin
	FIB Notice		8.	Evelyn Lauderdale ("Trustee") is the acting	File 6C - Shubili
			Ω	trustee of the Trust; There are currently three layeuite pending	
			9.	There are currently three lawsuits pending between Petitioner and Trustee: a Second	
				Amended Complaint for Damages filed by	
				Trustee that is currently before Honorable	
				Alan J. Simpson in Department 503 of the	
				Fresno Superior Court, a Petition to Determine	
				the Validity of the first and third amendments	
				to the Trust, filed in this Court by the Trustee,	
				and a Petition to Remove Trustee filed in this	
				Court by Petitioner;	
				Continued on Page 2	
<u> </u>					<u></u>

Page 2

- 10. In the Second Amended Complaint for Damages, Trustee alleges causes of action for Fraud, Elder Abuse, Conversion, Accounting, Recovery of Funds pursuant to Probate Code § 850, and Undue Influence. In the prayer for relief however, Trustee seeks only the following:
  - a. An order invalidating transfers of trust assets of the Plaintiff previously designated for transfer to Defendant Garcia and an order restoring title to the same in the trust;
  - b. A declaration of the rights, duties, and obligations of the parties herein;
  - c. An order that Defendant be required to account to Plaintiff for misappropriated funds and assets set forth;
  - d. An order that Defendant be subject to surcharge under the Probate Code for any interest Defendant may have in trust properties or assets;
  - e. For compensatory damages in amount according to proof;
  - f. For exemplary and punitive damages;
  - g. For interest at the legal rate on the sums alleged pursuant to § 3288 of the California Civil Code;
  - h. For attorney's fees pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code § 15657.5;
  - i. For costs of suit, equitable relief, for trial by jury, and other such relief the Court deems just and proper;
  - j. For treble damages pursuant to Civil Code §3345; and
  - k. For judgment for twice the value of the property recovered as provided by Probate Code § 859.
- 11. In the Second Amended Complaint, Trustee does not seek an order finding any of the amendments, including the fourth amendment invalid;
- 12. In the Petition to Determine Validity of Purported First and Third Amendments to the Trust, Trustee seeks only to invalidate the First and Third Amendments to the Trust and does not seek to impair the enforceability of the Fourth Amendment:
- 13. Because Trustee does not seek to invalidate the Fourth Amendment, Petitioner is entitled to receive the real property at 2045 W. San Ramon, Fresno, CA (the "Property) regardless of the outcome of the ongoing litigation;
- 14. Petitioner is currently residing in the 1991 Travel Trailer Holra located in the rear of the property at 2045 W. San Ramon. Petitioner began living in the trailer before Decedent's death and with her permission, and Decedent intended for Petitioner to receive both the trailer and the property upon her death, according to the all of the amendments of the Trust:
- 15. The property at 2045 W. San Ramon is currently vacant and has been since Decedent's death;
- 16. Because Petitioner is entitled to receive the property pursuant to the terms of the third amendment to the Trust, because the Fourth Amendment to the Trust explicitly republishes the provisions of the Trust as amended, because the outcome of the ongoing litigation will not affect Petitioner's entitlement to the Property, and because the Property is currently vacant, Petitioner requests that this Court order Trustee to distribute the Property to him as a preliminary distribution;
- 17. Petitioner is entitled to occupy the Property because it was specifically bequeathed to him by the Decedent in the amendments to the Trust and Petitioner will suffer imminent and irreparable harm if he is not permitted to occupy the Property because he is currently expecting the birth of his first child and is being forced to reside in a cramped, ill-equipped trailer located on the same parcel of real property as a house he would be entitled to occupy but for the actions of the Trustee;
- **18.** It is unlikely the Trustee will prevail in invalidating two of the four amendments to the Trust because Decedent obtained certificates of independent review in order to ensure that Petitioner would receive the Property, among other assets, upon her death;
- **19.** The residence on the Property is currently unoccupied, additionally, according to the Trustee, the location of the trailer and Petitioner's presence therein has generated fees and other financial penalties due to zoning violations that have been charged against the Trust. The extent of these fees is such that Trustee has previously attempted to impermissibly evict Petitioner from the trailer through a temporary restraining order filed in connection with the pending lawsuit in Department 503. Consequently, failure to allow

# **8C Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust (Trust)** Page 3

Case No. 11CEPR01018

Petitioner to occupy the Property will result in waste to the Trust because the Property will be unoccupied, more expensive (if not impossible) to insure, and will cause additional fees to be charged against the Trust as a result of Petitioner's residence in the trailer;

20. The Trustee and the Trust will suffer no harm in the event that Petitioner is entitled to occupy the Property. In fact, the Trustee and the trust estate stand to benefit substantially if Petitioner is entitled to occupy the Property because Trustee will be able to insure the Property at a reduced rate and will be able to rectify the zoning issues associated with the Trailer.

#### **Petitioner requests an Order:**

- 1. Instructing Trustee to transfer Property to Petitioner pursuant to the Jeri L. Shubin 2007 Trust, as amended;
- 2. Prohibiting Trustee from taking any action that would prevent Petitioner from occupying the residence located on the Property;
- 3. Awarding Petitioner attorney's fees and costs as allowed by law; and
- 4. Granting such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Atty

Boyett, Deborah K. (Private Counsel for Conservatee Harry Sager – Petitioner)

Petition for Order Fixing and Allowing Court- Appointed Attorney's Fees

			DEBORAH K. BOYETT, Petitioner, was	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
			Court-appointed to represent the	
			Conservatee on 1-9-12.	
			At hearing on 1-17-12, Petitioner was	
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		ordered relieved as Court-appointed	
_	Verified		counsel due to the fact dementia powers	
Ě			were not requested in the petition by the	
	Inventory		Public Guardian and the fact the Court was	
	PTC		informed that Conservatee had retained	
	Not.Cred.		private counsel.	
~	Notice of			
	Hrg		The Fresno County Public Guardian was	
~	Aff.Mail	W	appointed Conservator of the Person and	
	Aff.Pub.		Estate on 2-21-12.	
	Sp.Ntc.		5	
	Pers.Serv.		Petitioner asks that she be paid from the	
	Conf. Screen		conservatorship estate for 6.4 hours at	
	Letters		\$80.00/hr for a total of \$512.00.	
	<b>Duties/Supp</b>		Services are itemized by date and include	
	Objections		review of documents, communications	
	Video		with client and other counsel, attendance	
	Receipt		at hearing, and drafting this petition for	
	CI Report		fees.	
	9202		. 1955.	
~	Order			
	Aff. Posting			Reviewed by: skc
	Status Rpt			Reviewed on: 3-6-12
	UCCJEA			Updates:
	Citation			Recommendation:
	FTB Notice			File 9 - Sager

Sanoian, Joanne (for Petitioner Kimberly Bishoff)

Petition for Letters of Administration (Prob. C. 8002, 10450)

DOD: 11/23/11	KIMBERLY BISHOFF, daughter,	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
	is petitioner and requests	
	appointment as Administrator	
	without bond.	
Cont. from	without bollu.	
Aff.Sub.Wit.	A 11 1: 1 1	
	All heirs waive bond.	
✓ Verified		
Inventory	Full IAEA – o.k.	
PTC		
Not.Cred.	Decedent died intestate	
Notice of		
Hrg	Residence: Clovis	
✓ Aff.Mail W/	Publication: Fresno Business Journal	
✓ Aff.Pub.		
Sp.Ntc.	Estimated value of the estate:	
Pers.Serv.	Personal property - \$140,000.00	
Conf. Screen	Income - \$ 20,000.00	
✓ Letters	Real property \$80,000.00 Total - \$80,000.00	
✓ Duties/Supp	- \$ 500,000.00	
Objections		
Video		
Receipt		
CI Report		
9202		
√ Order		
Aff. Posting		Reviewed by: KT
Status Rpt		Reviewed on: 3/2/12
UCCJEA		Updates:
Citation		Recommendation:
FTB Notice		File 10 - Bishoff

Sullivan, J. Patrick (for Petitioner Elizabeth Sosaya)

**Spousal or Domestic Partner Property Petition (Prob. C. 13650)** 

DO	D: 12/28/11		ELIZABETH SOSAYA, surviving	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
			spouse, is petitioner.	, , , , , ,
			spouse, is pentioner.	
			No other proceedings	
Col	nt. from		No other proceedings	
COI	Aff.Sub.Wit.		W:11 d-4-d 10/05/11 d:	
-	Verified		Will dated 12/25/11 devises entire	
✓	verified		estate to spouse.	
	Inventory			
	PTC		Petitioner states she was married to	
	Not.Cred.		the Decedent for approximately 25	
1	Notice of		years. At no time during the	
	Hrg		marriage did the Decedent inherit	
✓	Aff.Mail	W/O	nor was he gifted any property. The	
	Aff.Pub.		two parcels of real property which is	
	Sp.Ntc.		the subject matter of this Petition	
	Pers.Serv.		were purchased by the parties during	
	Conf. Screen		the marriage using community	
	Letters		property funds.	
	Duties/Supp			
	Objections		Petitioner requests court	
	Video		confirmation that Decedent's	
	Receipt		interest in two parcels of real	
	CI Report		property passes to her.	
	9202			
✓	Order			
	Aff. Posting			Reviewed by: KT
	Status Rpt			Reviewed on: 3/2/12
	UCCJEA			Updates:
	Citation			Recommendation: SUBMITTED
	FTB Notice			File 11 - Sosaya

12 Atty Atty

Johnny Garcia (Estate)

LeVan, Nancy J. (for Lorena Garcia – Daughter – Administrator)

Emerzian, David L (for Omega Ochoa Garcia – Surviving Spouse)

### **Further Status Hearing**

DOD: 2-7-07	LORENA GARCIA, Daughter is Administrator	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
	with limited IAEA without bond.	Note: Examiner Notes from the 10-4-11 status
	Letters issued 7-21-08.	hearing with a brief chronology of this case are in the file for reference.
Cont. from 120611	On 7.14.00 the Court approved a settlement	Need account or current status report.
Aff.Sub.Wit.	<b>On 7-14-09</b> , the Court approved a settlement agreement between Administrator (daughter)	1. Need account of current status report.
Verified	and Omega Ochoa Garcia (surviving spouse)	Examiner notes that Letters issued
Inventory	and allowed continuation of estate	over 3 years ago and the Court approved continuation of estate administration
PTC	administration pending certain issues:	over 2 years ago.
Not.Cred.	<b>1)</b> Retrial of the damages portion of Civil Case	
Notice of	# 04CECG03607 Garcia v. Roberts; and	At recent hearings, status was provided
Hrg	<b>2)</b> Receipt of proceeds due from an eminent	regarding the civil matter; however,  account current or status of this estate
Aff.Mail	domain matter	is needed if the estate is not in a position
Aff.Pub.	domain matter	to be closed (Probate Code §12200).
Sp.Ntc.	On 10-4-11 (the 7 <sup>th</sup> status hearing regarding	At hearing on 7-26-11, the Court was
Pers.Serv.	retrial of the damages issue), Attorney	advised that the estate was awarded
Conf. Screen	Emerzian advised the Court that a motion for	\$184,798.00, but a new trial may affect
Letters	a new trial was denied and an appeal has	that award. The I&A value of the estate as
Duties/Supp	been filed, and that deposits need to be	of the date of death was \$5,125.00; however, it is unknown if other amounts
Objections	made. The Court set this hearing for further	have been recovered or received, etc.
Video	status.	
Receipt		For example, at this point, what is the
CI Report	Status Report filed 12-1-11 by Attorney	property on hand, and how is it held, etc.?
9202	LeVan states that Attorney Ty Kharazi filed a	
Order	Notice of Appeal on behalf of his clients, the Roberts'. The Fifth District Court of Appeal has	
Aff. Posting		Reviewed by: skc
Status Rpt X	Attorney LeVan requests to set a status	Reviewed on: 3-2-12
UCCJEA	hearing in March 2012 to follow the progress	Updates:
Citation	of the appeal.	Recommendation:
FTB Notice		File 12 - Garcia
	Minute Order 12-6-12: No appearances.	
	Matter continued to 3-13-12.	
	As of 3-2-12, nothing further has been filed.	

13A Donna Carter (CONS/E)

Case No. 11CEPR01087

- Atty Romaine, William A. (of Hanford, for Petitioner Edward R. Bodley)
- Atty Teixeira, J. Stanley (Court appointed for Conservatee)
- Atty Kruthers, Heather (for the Public Guardian Conservator)

Petition for Appointment of Probate Conservator of the Estate (Prob. C. 1820, 1821, 2680-2682)

A ~ ~	: 80 years		TEMPODADY WILL EVOIDE UPON	NICEDS (DDODLENAS (CONANACNIES
	: 80 years 3: 1/5/1931		TEMPORARY WILL EXPIRE UPON	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
	. 1/3/1331		ISSUANCE OF LETTERS TO A	Continued from 2/28/12. Minute Order states: The
-			<u>GENERAL CONSERVATOR</u>	Court notes for the record that Mr. Romaine is not
				present due to family issues. The Court vacates today's
			<b>DONNA CARTER,</b> by and through her	trial date. The Court sets a Status Hearing for 3/13/12.
Con	t. from		attorney-in-fact, EDWARD R. BODLEY,	The temporary letters are extended until the General
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		is petitioner and requests <b>EDWARD R.</b>	Hearing or until the hearing on the termination.
٧	Verified		<b>BODLEY</b> , cousin, be appointed as	Note: Attorney Stanley Teixeria was appointed as
_			conservator of the Estate. (Note: Per C.I.	counsel for Conservatee on 12/14/11.
	Inventory		Report, it appears Mr. Bodley has	Counsel for Conselvatee on 12/14/11.
	PTC		nominated the Public Guardian as	VOTING RIGHTS NOT AFFECTED
	Not.Cred.		Conservator. The Public Guardian is the	VOIM OR GILLS HOT MIT BOILE
	Notice of Hrg	Χ	current temporary Conservator per	Court Investigator Advised Rights on 1/17/12
	Aff.Mail	Χ	Court's order of 1/26/12. Prior to that	
	Aff.Pub.		date, the temporary conservator was	1. Need Notice of Hearing.
	Sp.Ntc.		Mr. Bodley, who was appointed a	2. Petition names the Petitioner as Donna Carter, by and through Edward R. Bodley, her Attorney-In-
	Pers.Serv.	Χ	temporary conservator, ex parte, on	Fact. The court may require a copy of the
H	Conf. Screen		12/20/12.)	document appointing Edward R. Bodley as
H	Letters	Х		Attorney-In-Fact.
		^	Estimated value of the Estate:	3. Petition requests that bond be fixed at \$75,000.00.
	Duties/Supp		Personal property - \$40.000.00	If bond is required, however, it should be set at
	Objections		Annual income - \$33,600.00	\$80,960.00, which includes the cost of recovery.
	Video Receipt		7 milet meonie \$35,000.00	4. Need Capacity Declaration.
٧	CI Report		*NEED CAPACITY DECLARATION	5. Need Duties of Conservator.
	9202		NEED CALACITY DECLARATION	6. Need Conservatorship Video Viewing Certificate.
	Order	Х	Datitionan states he recently become	7. Need Citation to proposed Conservatee. PrC
			Petitioner states he recently became	§1823.
			alarmed after the return of a former	8. Need proof of personal service, 15 court days
			caretaker into the proposed Conservatee's	prior to the hearing, of the <i>Notice of Hearing</i>
			good graces, the proposed Conservatee is	along with a copy of the <i>Petition on:</i>
			again losing funds from her bank accounts.	a. Donna Carter (proposed Conservatee)
			Given her now favorable disposition to the	9. Need proof of 15 court days service by mail prior
			former caretaker, the proposed	to the hearing of the <i>Notice of Hearing</i> along with a copy of the <i>Petition</i> or declaration of due
			Conservatee may well be unduly	diligence on:
			influenced to retract petitioner's power of	a. Sharon Brazil (daughter)
			attorney and appoint the former caretaker	b. Dennis Brazil (son)
			in his stead. If this should happen, the	c. Kyle Weisenberger (brother)
			estate may well be dissipated before a	10. Need Orders and Letters.
	Aff. Posting		hearing can take place.	Reviewed by: NRN
	Status Rpt		PROBATE REFEREE: RICK SMITH	Reviewed on: 3/6/12
	UCCJEA			Updates:
	Citation	Х		Recommendation:
	FTB Notice			File 13A - Carter

### 13A (additional page) Donna Carter (CONS/E) Case No. 11CEPR01087

COURT INVESTIGATOR JO ANN MORRIS' REPORT, filed 1/19/12, states: It appears that proposed Conservatee has been having serious short-term memory issues as was evidenced during the (C.I.'s) interview. She did not remember their first meeting nor did she recall filing a civil action against her friend Kathy Young and did not remember having Kathy Young's name on her accounts as recently as August of last year. There were numerous withdrawals from proposed Conservatee's accounts during the time Kathy Young's name was on the accounts, that were unlikely to have been made by proposed Conservatee. For instance, \$2,400 was spent at FoodMaxx between 5/11 and 8/11. Additionally, Kathy Young's mother admitted that proposed Conservatee helped her daughter (Kathy Young) with funds to buy a truck. The Petitioner, Edward Bodley, has expressed that he no longer wishes to be appointed as conservator, due to proposed Conservatee's hostility towards him. He would like to nominate the Public Guardian to be her Conservator. Since it does appear that Ms. Carter is subject to undue influence and fraud, it is recommended that the Public Guardian be appointed as conservator of the estate.

13A

13B Donna Carter (CONS/E)

Case No. 11CEPR01087

Atty Romaine, William A. (of Hanford, for Petitioner Edward R. Bodley)

Atty Teixeira, J. Stanley (Court appointed for Conservatee)

Atty Kruthers, Heather (for the Public Guardian – Conservator)

Status Hearing Re: Petition for Appointment of Probate Conservator of the Estate (Prob. C. 1820, 1821, 2680-2682)

The Petition for Appointment of Conservator was originally Age: **NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMME** scheduled for hearing on 1/26/12, and was continued to 2/28/12 NTS: DOD: for a Court Trial on the Petition. At the 2/28/12 hearing, the Court vacated the trial date and set a status hearing on the 1. Need former Petition for 3/13/12. <u>Page 13A concerns the actual Petition for</u> temporary conservator Conservatorship, which also appears to have been continued Cont. from **Edward Bodley's** from the last hearing date. court-ordered Aff.Sub.Wit. accounting. Verified The Public Guardian is the current temporary Conservator. Inventory **Background: PTC** Donna Carter "by and through Edward R. Bodley, her Not.Cred. attorney-in-fact" filed a temporary and general petitions for Notice of conservatorship on 12/9/12; Hrg This Court granted Petitioner's temporary petition *ex parte* Aff.Mail on 12/12/11; Attorney Stanley Teixeira was appointed to represent Aff.Pub. Conservatee on 12/14/11; Sp.Ntc. At the initial 12/20/12 hearing on the temporary petition, the Pers.Serv. petition was denied because there were no appearances, Conf. Screen though the general hearing remained set for 1/26/12; At the 1/26/12 general hearing, the Court granted on its own Letters motion a temporary conservatorship of the estate and **Duties/Supp** appointed the Public Guardian as conservator. Additionally, **Objections** the court ordered Edward Bodley to place Conservatee's Video funds into a separate account and to prepare an accounting Receipt for any funds transferred up until that date (1/26/12), and to also provide Mr. Teixeira with a copy of the accounting. At **CI Report** that hearing, Attorney Teixeira requested that the general 9202 petition be set for trial with a two hour estimate (trial set for Order 2/18/12): Reviewed by: NRN Aff. Posting At the 2/28/12 hearing, Attorney for Edward Bodley, Reviewed on: 3/6/12 **Status Rpt** William Romaine was not present due to family issues. The court vacated the trial date, and set a status hearing for **UCCJEA Updates:** 3/13/12. The court further extended the Public Guardian's Citation **Recommendation:** temporary letters "until the General Hearing or until the File 13 - Carter **FTB Notice** hearing on the termination." Nothing has been filed since the last hearing. It appears from the file that Mr. Bodley has not filed the court-ordered accounting for the funds he transferred when he was the temporary conservator from 12/12/11 to 1/26/12.

13B

Maddison Elizabeth Merrill (GUARD/E)

Merrill, Aja M. (pro per Petitioner/mother/Guardian)

2nd Account of Maddison Elizabeth Merrill

A TALE MANUAL AND DATE OF MANUAL AND DATE OF THE AND				
Age: 5 years old	<b>AJA MERRILL</b> , guardian, is	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:		
DOB: 6/21/2006	petitioner.  Account period: 9/1/09 – 10/31/11	Continued from 1/17/12. Minute order states there are no appearances. The court continues the matter to 3/13/12 and orders Aja Merrill to be present on 3/13/12. The Court further		
Cont. from 011712		orders a copy of the examiner notes be sent to the petitioner. Proof of service indicates the		
Aff.Sub.Wit.	Balance of the minor's blocked	minute order was mailed to Aja Merrill on		
√ Verified	account as Chase Bank as of	1/20/12. As of 3/2/12 the following issues remain:		
Inventory	10/18/11 was \$19,711.13	1. This 2 <sup>nd</sup> Account was filed using a fee		
PTC		waiver. Accountings are considered to be		
Not.Cred.		costs of administration. There are assets in the guardianship estate to pay the filing		
Notice of X		fee.		
Hrg		2. Accounting does not comply with Probate		
Aff.Mail X		Code §1060.		
Aff.Pub.		3. Accounting is not on the mandatory		
Sp.Ntc.		Judicial Council forms. Probate Code §		
Pers.Serv.		2620.		
Conf. Screen		4. Petition was not signed by the Co-		
Letters		Guardian/father Samuel Merrill.		
Duties/Supp		5. Need Notice of Hearing.		
Objections		6. Need proof of service of the <i>Notice of</i>		
Video		Hearing on Maddison Merrill (minor)		
Receipt	=	pursuant to Probate Code §1460.		
CI Report		7. Need Order.		
9202	4			
Order X	_	Davisous d box 1/T		
Aff. Posting	_	Reviewed by: KT		
Status Rpt	_	Reviewed on: 3/2/12		
UCCJEA Citation	-	Updates: Recommendation:		
FTB Notice	=	File 14 - Merrill		
FID NOTICE		File 14 - Weffili		

## 15 Angel Miramontes and Yareli Miramonte (GUARD/P) Case No. 12CEPR00048

#### Atty Corona, Maria (for Petitioner/maternal grandmother Maria Corona)

Petition for Appointment of Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 1510)

	Petition for Appointment of Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 1510)				
	Angel age: 8 years DOB: 12/8/2003		Temporary Expires 3/13/2012	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:	
Yar	Yareli age 7 months DOB: 6/2/2011		MARIA CORONA, maternal grandmother, is petitioner.	<ol> <li>Need Notice of Hearing.</li> <li>Need proof of personal service of the</li> </ol>	
			Angel's father: <b>ANGEL MIRANDA</b> –	Notice of Hearing along with a copy of the petition or Consent and Waiver of	
Coi	nt. from		Yareli's father: <b>LUIS FABIAN</b>	Notice or Declaration of Due Diligence	
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		GUTIERREZ	on: a. Angel Miranda (Angel's father)	
✓	Verified		Mother: YAIRA MIRAMONTES –	b. Luis Fabian Gutierrez (Aareli's father)	
	Inventory		consents and waives notice.	rather)	
	PTC		consents and warres nonec.	3. Need proof of service of the <i>Notice of</i>	
	Not.Cred.		Angel's paternal grandfather: Fernando	Hearing along with a copy of the	
	Notice of	Х	Miranda	petition or Consent and Waiver of	
	Hrg		Angel's paternal grandmother: Liliana	Notice or Declaration of Due Diligence	
	Aff.Mail	Χ	Miranda	on: a. Fernando Miranda (Angel's	
	Aff.Pub.		Yareli's paternal grandfather: Luis Gutierrez	paternal grandfather)	
	Sp.Ntc.		Yareli's paternal grandmother: Mrs.	b. Liliana Miranda (Angel's paternal	
	Pers.Serv.	Х	Gutierrez	grandmother)	
<b>√</b>	Conf. Screen		Maternal grandfather: Hector Miramontes	c. Luis Gutierrez (Yareli's paternal	
<b>✓</b>	Letters		<b>Petitioner states</b> on 1/8/2012 the mother was arrested for hitting her oldest child	grandfather) d. Mrs. Gutierrez (Yareli's paternal grandmother)	
✓	Duties/Supp		Angel. CPS place a safety plan where	e. Hector Miramontes (maternal	
	Objections		Petitioner was to continue caring for the children and was to keep the mother away	grandfather)	
	Video Receipt		from the home where the children were residing. Petitioner is fearful that once		
✓	CI Report		released the mother will come and pick up		
	9202		the children. Petitioner is also concerned		
1	Order		that the fathers will come and pick up the		
	Aff. Posting		children. Angel's father has a history of spousal abuse and Yareli's father is an	Reviewed by: KT	
	Status Rpt		alcoholic and abuses drugs.	Reviewed on: 3/2/12	
<b>√</b>	UCCJEA			Updates:	
	Citation		Court Investigator Dina Calvillo's Report filed on 2/24/12.	Recommendation:	
	FTB Notice		inea on 2/24/12.	File 15 - Miramontes	
			11	15	

Valerie Irene Medina (GUARD/P)
Martinez, Yrene (pro per Petitioner/maternal grandmother)

Petition for Appointment of Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 1510)

	Petition for Appointment of Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 1510)				
Age: 3 years			THERE IS NO TEMPORARY.	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:	
DOB: 9/8/2008			No temporary was requested.		
-			YRENE MARTINEZ, maternal	1. Need proof of personal service of the	
			grandmother, is petitioner.	Notice of Hearing along with a copy of	
			grandmonier, is petitioner.	the Petition or Consent and Waiver of	
Co	nt. from			Notice or Declaration of Due Diligence	
	Aff.Sub.Wit.		Father: <b>JOSE JESUS MEDINA</b>	on:	
				a. Jose Jesus Medina (father)	
✓	Verified		Mother: <b>ROSARIO IRENE</b>	` ′	
	Inventory				
-	-		<b>MEDINA</b> – consents and waives		
<b> </b>	PTC		notice. (Now deceased.)		
	Not.Cred.				
1	Notice of		Paternal grandfather: Jose Jesus		
"	Hrg				
	Aff.Mail	W/	Medina – served on 1/31/12.		
✓	Allivian	**/	Paternal grandmother: Selena		
	Aff.Pub.		Creeapaum – served on 1/31/12.		
	Sp.Ntc.		Maternal grandfather: Jesus Reyes –		
	Pers.Serv.		•		
			Declaration of Due Diligence.		
✓	Conf. Screen				
<b>√</b>	Letters		<b>Petitioner states</b> mother has cancer		
<b>'</b>			and has days to live. Father is		
<u>/</u>	Duties/Supp		incarcerated in Mississippi.		
	Objective				
	Objections		Petitioner has been a part of the		
	Video		minor's life since birth.		
	Receipt				
1	CI Report		Court Investigator Samantha		
ľ	_				
	9202		Henson's Report filed on 3/6/12.		
<b>√</b>	Order				
	Aff. Posting			Reviewed by: KT	
				-	
	Status Rpt			Reviewed on: 3/2/12	
✓	UCCJEA			Updates: 3/8/12	
	Citation			Recommendation:	
	FTB Notice			File 16 - Medina	
<u> </u>	I I D HOUCE			THE 10 - MICHINA	

17 Atty

Solorzano, Elvia (pro per Petitioner/paternal grandmother)

Petition for Appointment of Temporary Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 2250)

			Petition for Appointment of Temporary C	Buardian of the Person (Prob. C. 2250)
Age: 1 ½ years			GENERAL HEARING 4/30/2012	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
DO	B: 5/3/2010		ELVIA SOLORZANO, paternal grandmother, is petitioner.	1. Need Notice of Hearing.
Cont. from Aff.Sub.Wit.			Father: STEPHEN SOLORZANO  Mother: DESTINY GONZALES	2. Need proof of personal service of the Notice of Hearing along with a copy of the Temporary Petition or Consent and Waiver of Notice or Declaration of Due
✓ —	Inventory PTC		Paternal grandfather: Severiano	Diligence on: a. Stephen Solorzano (father) b. Destiny Gonzales (mother)
	Not.Cred.		Soloranzo	
	Notice of Hrg	Х	Maternal grandfather: Ernest Gonzales	
	Aff.Mail		Maternal grandmother: Gloria	
	Aff.Pub.		Gonzales	
	Sp.Ntc.			
	Pers.Serv.	Χ	<b>Petitioner states</b> the minor resided	
1	Conf. Screen		with his father (who resides with	
✓	Letters		Petitioner) on alternating weekends. On the weekend of February 5, 2012,	
✓	Duties/Supp		the child was left in Petitioner's care	
	Objections		by his mother who has not returned	
	Video		for the child. The father is presently	
	Receipt		incarcerated for an outstanding	
	CI Report		warrant and is unable to physically	
	9202		care for the minor. Petitioner states	
✓	Order		she has had no contact from the	
	Aff. Posting		mother since February 5, 2012.	Reviewed by: KT
	Status Rpt		Petitioner states a temporary is	Reviewed on: 3/5/12
✓	UCCJEA		necessary because there are no other	Updates:
	Citation		adults able to care for the minor.	Recommendation:
	FTB Notice			File 17 - Solozano

18 Atty

Cruz, Javier (pro per Petitioner/mom's long term boyfriend)

Petition for Appointment of Temporary Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 2250)

1		Petition for Appointment of Temporary G	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Age: 17 years		GENERAL HEARING 5/1/2012	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
DOB: 11/6/1994		<b>JAVIER CRUZ,</b> mom's long term boyfriend, is petitioner.	1. Need Notice of Hearing.
Cont. from Aff.Sub.Wit.  Verified Inventory PTC Not.Cred. Notice of Hrg Aff.Mail Aff.Pub. Sp.Ntc. Pers.Serv.  Conf. Screen  Letters  Duties/Supp Objections Video Receipt CI Report 9202  Order	X	Father: UNKNOWN  Mother: VIOLET LORRIANA MITTIE – deceased.  Paternal grandparents: Unknown Maternal grandfather: Unknown Maternal grandmother: Wanda Nelms – deceased.  Sibling: Matthew Snarr – consents and waives notice.  Minor: Christopher Mittie – consents and waives notice.  Petitioner states the minor's mother recently passed away, his father is an unknown person not listed on the birth certificate. The child needs a temporary guardian as he has no parents, is still in school and requires someone to take care of him.	<ul> <li>2. Need proof of personal service of the Notice of Hearing along with a copy of the Temporary Petition or Consent and Waiver of Notice or Declaration of Due Diligence on:</li> <li>a. Unknown father – unless the court dispenses with notice.</li> </ul>
Aff. Posting			Reviewed by: KT
Status Rpt	<u> </u>		Reviewed by: K1 Reviewed on: 3/5/12
✓ UCCJEA			Updates:
Citation			Recommendation:
FTB Notice	l		File 18 - Mittie
	<u> </u>		=

## Brandon David Solis and Audrina Marie Solis (GUARD/P)

Case No. 12CEPR00055

Atty Cruz, Javier (pro per Temporary Guardian of Audrina Solis)
Atty Parks, Jeffrey N (pro per Petitioner/maternal step-grandfather)
Atty Parks, MaryAnn (pro per Petitioner/maternal grandmother)

19

Petition for Appointment of Temporary Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 2250)

Brandon age: 4 years	GENERAL HEARING 4/26/2012	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
DOB: 8/31/2007  Audrina age: 3 years DOB: 1/20/2009  Cont. from Aff.Sub.Wit. Verified Inventory PTC Not.Cred. Notice of Hrg Aff.Mail Aff.Pub. Sp.Ntc. Pers.Serv. VConf. Screen VIEtters Unites/Supp Objections Video Receipt CI Report 9202	MARY ANN PARKS, maternal grandmother, and JEFFREY PARKS, maternal step-grandfather, are petitioners.  JAVIER CRUZ is currently the temporary guardian of Audrina Solis. Letters expire 3/19/12.  Brandon's father: FERNANDO MORA – Declaration of Due Diligence filed on 3/9/12.  Audrina's father: GERALDO GUIBA—Declaration of Due Diligence filed on 3/9/12.	Note: JAVIER CRUZ was appointed temporary guardian of Audrina Solis only. Javier's temporary Letters expire on 3/19/12 the date of his general hearing. In addition, Javier Cruz is petitioning on page 18 to be appointed guardian of Christopher Mittie (no relation to this minor).  1. Petitioners' fee waiver was denied. A filing fee of \$225.00 is due.  2. Need Notice of Hearing.  3. Need proof of personal service of the Notice of Hearing along with a copy of the temporary petition or Consent and Waiver of Notice or Declaration of Due Diligence on: a. Javier Cruz (temporary guardian) b. Fernando Mora (Brandon's father) if court does not dispense with notice. c. Geraldo Guiba (Audrina's father) – if court does not dispense with notice.
√ Order	the mother and them. Violet died on	
Aff. Posting	2/14/12. Since then Audria has been	Reviewed by: KT
Status Rpt	living with two adult men, one being	Reviewed on: 3/5/12
√ UCCJEA	Javier the other being Matt, the son of Violet, who has a felony record. There is	Updates: 3/9/12
Citation	also a younger son of Violet's Chris, he is	Recommendation:
FTB Notice	17. This leaves Audrina with no	File 19 - Solis
	motherly care at the age of 3.	19

## 20 Angel Anthony Chapa (GUARD/P)

**Case No. 08CEPR00438** 

Atty Weinberg, Michael S. (for Michelle Willard – Paternal grandmother/Guardian/Petitioner and Terry Willard – paternal step-grandfather/Petitioner)

Petition for Appointment of Temporary Co-Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 2250)

Age: 5			GENERAL HEARING 05/01/12	NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:
DOB	: 08/07/06		MICHELLE WILLARD, paternal grandmother, and TERRY WILLARD, paternal step-grandfather, are Petitioners.	<ol> <li>Need Notice of Hearing.</li> <li>Declarations of Attorney Michael Weinberg filed 03/06/12 and 03/09/12 state that the</li> </ol>
✓   	Aff.Mail Aff.Pub. Sp.Ntc. Pers.Serv. Conf. Screen Letters Duties/Supp Objections Video Receipt CI Report	x	MICHELLE WILLARD, paternal grandmother, was appointed Guardian of the Person and Letters were issued on 09/08/08.  Father: ANTHONY CHAPA  Mother: MARIBEL REBOLLEDO  Paternal grandfather: NOT LISTED  Maternal grandparents: NOT LISTED  Petitioners state that Michelle Willard was appointed guardian of Angel on 09/08/08. It is now necessary for the continued care and upbringing of Angel that her husband, Terry Willard, be appointed as temporary coguardian pending his permanent appointment as co-guardian.  Declarations of Attorney Michael Weinberg filed 03/06/12 and 03/09/12 state that the current whereabouts of both of the	whereabouts of both parents is unknown and requests that notice be dispensed with. If Diligence is not found, need proof of personal service of Notice of Hearing with a copy of the Petition for Temporary Guardianship or Consent and Waiver of Notice or Declaration of Due Diligence for:  - Anthony Chapa (father)  - Maribel Rebolledo (mother)
✓ <u> </u>	Order  Aff. Posting  Status Rpt  UCCJEA  Citation  FTB Notice		parents is unknown; but both parents previously consented to the appointment of the Guardian, Michelle Willard when they knew the child would be living with the Guardian and Co-Petitioner, Terry Willard; therefore, it is reasonable to assume that would not now object to the appointment of Mr. Willard as co-guardian. Mr. Weinberg requests that notice to both parents be dispensed with.	Reviewed by: JF  Reviewed on: 03/06/12  Updates: 03/09/12  Recommendation:  File 20 - Chapa